<center>REMARKS</center>

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 12, 2007. Claims 1 to 49, 52 to 65, 68 to 80, 83 to 96, 99 to 111, 114 to 127 and 130 to 137 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 14, 26, 39, 54, 70, 85, 101 and 116 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 7 to 10, 14, 17, 20 to 22, 26, 29, 32 to 35, 39, 43, 49, 54, 59, 65, 70, 74, 80, 85, 90, 96, 101, 105, 111, 116, 121, 127 and 135 to 137 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,932 (Davis) in view of Japan 2000-305725 (Yoshimoto) and U.S. Patent No. 6,184,996 (Gase), Claims 2, 3, 6, 15, 16, 19, 27, 28, 31, 40 to 42, 44 to 46, 56 to 58, 60 to 62, 71 to 73, 75 to 77, 87 to 89, 91 to 93, 102 to 104, 106 to 108, 117 to 120, 122 to 124 and 132 to 134 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Davis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,741 (Hertling), Yoshimoto and Gase, Claims 5, 13, 18, 25, 30, 38, 55, 86 and 117 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Davis in view of Hertling, U.S. Patent No. 6,337,745 (Aiello), Yoshimoto and Gase, and Claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 36, 37, 47, 48, 52, 53, 63, 64, 68, 69, 78, 79, 83, 84, 94, 95, 99, 100, 109, 110, 114, 115, 125, 126, 130 and 131 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Davis in view of Hertling, Aiello, U.S. Patent No. 6,581,092 (Motoyama), Yoshimoto and Gase. The rejections are respectfully traversed and the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in light of the following comments.

The present invention concerns obtaining control over the capabilities of a printing device so that an intended recipient of a print job does not have to wait for other jobs to print out first, but instead, can obtain control over the printer to have their own

<center>- 28 -</center>

print jobs printed out first while other jobs are deferred from being printed. In the invention, a user obtains control over the printing device's print capabilities or printing operations. Once control over the printing device's print capabilities/printing operations has been obtained, print jobs/images that are not intended for the intended recipient gaining control of the device are deferred from being printed out during a period in which the user has control. Therefore, until the user relinquishes control over the device's capabilities, print jobs received by the printer ahead of the user's job are deferred until the user relinquishes control. As a result, since the user has control over the device, he/she can perform any of various operations during the control period, while at the same time, other print jobs that are not intended for the recipient are deferred (i.e., not printed out) while the user maintains control or until the user relinquishes control.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 is a method for obtaining exclusive control of a printing device's print capabilities by a recipient to print data intended for the recipient, the method comprising the steps of authenticating the recipient, providing the recipient exclusive control of the printing device's print capabilities after the recipient has been authenticated, and temporarily deferring print data not intended for the recipient, which is input to the printing device prior to print data intended for the recipient, from being printed and printing print data intended for the recipient during a period in which the recipient has exclusive control of the printing device's print capabilities.

Amended independent Claims 14 and 26 are apparatus and computer-executable process steps claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 1.

Independent Claim 39 includes features along the lines of Claim 1, but is directed more specifically to a method of printing images on a printing device, comprising the steps of providing a recipient which has been authenticated with control over printing operations of the printing device, and performing a process to print out an image, intended for the recipient which has been authenticated, by the printing device during a period of control over the printing device, wherein an image not intended for the recipient, which is input to the printing device prior to the image intended for the recipient, is deferred from being printed during the period of control over the printing device.

Independent Claims 70 and 101 are apparatus and computer-executable process steps claims, respectively, that roughly correspond to Claim 39.

Independent Claim 54 also includes features along the lines of Claim 1, but is more specifically directed to a method of controlling printing operations of a printing device, comprising the steps of providing a recipient who has been authenticated with control over the printing operations of the printing device, and maintaining control over the printing operations until control is manually relinquished by the recipient who has obtained control, wherein an image not intended for the recipient, which is input to the printing device before the recipient is provided with control over the printing operations of the printing device, is deferred from being printed until control is manually relinquished by the recipient.

Independent Claims 85 and 116 are apparatus and computer-executable process steps claims that roughly correspond to Claim 54.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1, 14, 25, 39, 54, 70, 85, 101 and 116, and in

particular, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of providing an authenticated recipient with exclusive control of a printing device's print capabilities, and deferring print data not intended for the recipient, which is input to the printing device prior to print data intended for the recipient, from being printed and printing print data intended for the recipient during a period in which the recipient has exclusive control of the printing device's print capabilities.

Davis and Yoshimoto have been discussed in Applicants' prior responses and the present Office Action now more or less admits to the shortcomings of those references since the Office Action now cites Gase in combination with Davis and Yoshimoto.

Nonetheless, a previously discussed, Davis is seen to disclose that, upon receiving a print job, a print node determines whether a document of the print job is a sensitive document or not, and if so, stores the document in an internal buffer memory. To print the sensitive document, the user is authenticated at the printer, whereby the print node decrypts the document and the document is queued for printing. (See column 6, lines 33 to 48.) The fact that the decrypted document is queued is one significant distinction from the present invention.

In this regard, queuing a document merely provides for inserting the document into the print queue with other print jobs so that the job is printed out in turn. That is, Davis merely provides one advantage over conventional print job queuing techniques, in which jobs are queued upon receipt, by providing the ability to defer queuing of the job if it is a sensitive document until the user is authenticated at the printer. In other words, Davis merely provides a way to defer submitting a print job to a print

queue for printing until such time as the recipient has been authenticated and is present at the printer to obtain the printed document. The fact that the user is authenticated at the printer in no way provides the user with exclusive control over the printer's printing capabilities, but rather, merely releases a locally stored sensitive document to the print queue for printing. Moreover, there is no disclosure in Davis that any print jobs already pending in the queue are deferred from being printed out, much less that the deferral continues for a period in which the user has exclusive control. Thus, Davis is clearly distinguishable from the present invention.

Also as previously discussed, Yoshimoto, it is seen to disclose providing the user with the ability to alter the order of print jobs in a print queue. A control unit provides the user with the ability to control the ordering of print jobs in the queue so that the user can either move a job up in the order, or down in the order. While the user is processing the request, jobs in the queue continue to be processed in turn until the user selects an OK button to change the queue order. When the user presses the OK button, the order of the jobs in the queue is changed based on the user's input, but otherwise, printing operations continue as normal. Thus, at best, the user is provided with the ability to control the order of jobs in the queue, but all other print capabilities of the printer remain under the control of the printer, including processing jobs in the queue that where input before the user's job. In other words, the user is not provided with exclusive control over the printer's printing capabilities, but is only provided with the ability to change the queue order. Moreover, the only "period of control" that the user is provided with is the instantaneous selection of the OK button to change the order, which merely results in changing the queue order. Therefore, it is simply not possible to defer printing of jobs

input to the printer before the user's job "during a period in which the user has control over the printer's printing capabilities." Thus, Yoshimoto also does not disclose or suggest the features of the present invention.

Turning now to the newly-cited Gase, it is seen to teach a technique for remotely controlling a print queue of a network printer. According to the patent, the printer has a server procedure that enables the printer to transfer files from the printer, and a browser procedure that enables the printer to retrieve files from client processors over the network. Gase utilizes a web server application to provide a user with the ability to change the order of jobs in a queue. When a user clicks on job's button 41 in a printer home page displayed on client processor 10, client processor 10 obtains a web page illustrating the jobs on job queue 28 (col. 3, lines 52-58). When a particular job is selected out of the jobs displayed on the obtained web page by the user, client processor 10 displays a "job detail" page about the particular job (col. 3, lines 59-67). Then, the user modifies the queue position of the particular job on job queue 28, using change button 60 displayed on the job detail page (col. 4, lines 20-36). Thus, as can readily be seen, the web server functions utilizing HTTP. As is well known in the art, HTTP is merely a series of messages and responses. In Gase, a user at a remote client accesses the web server of a printer and is provided with a web page for the printer as a response. The user can then perform various operations in the provided web page to change the order of jobs in the queue of the printer. When the user performs an operation on the client, a message is sent to the web server of the printer. In so doing, the client merely sends an HTTP message to the web server of the printer, whereby the printer executes an operation to rearrange the jobs in the queue based on the HTTP message.

Thus, as Applicants understand Gase, a user is not provided with exclusive control over the printer as in the context of the invention, and as such, other print jobs are not deferred *during a period in which the user has exclusive control over the printer's capabilities*. That is, the user merely changes the order of jobs with an HTTP message. Once the job queue is processed accordingly, there is nothing keeping another user form also submitting an HTTP message to arrange the queue in a different order a split second after the user. Thus, multiple users can perform operations to rearrange the jobs in the queue since the user does not have or maintain control. For example, user A may rearrange the queue so that jobs pending for user A can be advanced to the front of the queue. However, once the HTTP message is sent to the web server of the printer and is processed, other users can immediately rearrange the queue again. For instance, user B may issue a message to rearrange the queue for user B's jobs. Thus, neither user A nor user B are provided with exclusive control over the printer in the sense intended in the claimed invention whereby the user has exclusive control for an extended period and the jobs of others are deferred during that extended period.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 14, 25, 39, 54, 70, 85, 101 and 116, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable over Davis, Yoshimoto and Gase.

The other applied references, namely Hertling, Aiello and Motoyama, have been studied but are not seen to add anything that, when combined with Davis, Yoshimoto, and/or Gase would have rendered the present invention obvious.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

_____
Attorney for Applicants
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1964612v1